The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Amherst Papyri *The Amherst Papyri, being an Account of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of Lord Amherst of Hackney.* by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt. Part I. Frowde, Quaritch. 1900. 15s. net.

F. C. Buekitt

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 09 / December 1900, pp 457 - 459

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0008207X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0008207X

How to cite this article:

F. C. Buekitt (1900). Review of Terry D. Hargrave, and William T. Anderson 'Finishing Well: Aging and Reparation in the Intergenerational Family' The Classical Review, 14, pp 457-459 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0008207X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE AMHERST PAPYRI.

The Amherst Papyri, being an Account of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of Lord Amherst of Hackney. By BERNARD P. GREENFELL and ARTHUR S. HUNT. Part I. Frowde, Quaritch. 1900. 15s. net.

THE volume here noticed contains the theological texts which have been recently obtained in Egypt for Lord Amherst by that distinguished pair of Oxford scholars, who discovered at Oxyrhynchus the so-called *Logia* and the new poem of Sappho. The collection includes some Biblical fragments, of which perhaps the most interesting is No. VIII., a vellum leaf of the fifth or sixth century containing the greater part of Acts ii 11-22. In ii 13* the fragment lends some support to a singular reading of Codex Bezae ([δ]ε[λ]ε[υ]α[ζ]ον λέγοντες), but does not agree with it in its insertion of οἱ two words lower down.

More noteworthy is No. III, a letter from Rome about the end of the third century to some Christians living in the Arsinoite nome. This writing 'is amongst the earliest Christian documents from Egypt that have come down to us, but its condition is unfortunately so mutilated that little connected sense is attainable' (p. 28). It is clear however that the letter is about a sum of money which was to be paid in Alexandria to the writers. On the back 'in a hand of the time of Constantine' (pp. 30, 31) is written the first five verses of Genesis, first according to the lxx. and then according to the version of Aquila. This singular extract (3 from the Hexapla) is very well reproduced in facsimile in the frontispiece and carefully edited by Mr. Grenfell and Mr. Hunt, but the ancient scholar who noted it down does not seem to have aimed at a high standard of accuracy, omitting among other things the last half of verse 2. In the main, of course, the fragment agrees with what Field has edited: it begins ἐν κεφαλῇ ἐκτίσεν θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν.

No. II. in this volume is also a curiosity, being a Christian Acrostic Hymn, the lines or stanzas of which begin with the twenty-four letters of the alphabet in succession, three times repeated in each stanza. Chapter iii. of the Book of Lamentations is constructed on the same plan, but the resemblance is probably accidental. The metre is rather elastic, the chief rule being that the penultimate syllable of each short line is

accented and generally short. The acrostic form combined with marked inattention to quantity reminds one of the work of a contemporary author, the Latin rhythmist Commodian. The papyrus itself is assigned to the first half of the fourth century.

But the editors have rightly given the place of honour in this first volume of the Amherst Papyri to fourteen papyrus leaves containing a considerable fragment of the *Ascension of Isaiah* in a Greek uncial hand of the fifth or sixth century. This apocryphal work has hitherto only been known from the Ethiopic version and some Latin fragments. It consists of two main parts: chapters i.-v. relate the martyrdom of Isaiah in the days of wicked king Manasseh, while chapters vi.-xi. tell of Isaiah's Vision, when he was taken up alive into the Seventh Heaven and prophetically witnessed the Descent of Christ through the seven heavens to the earth to be born of the Virgin Mary at Bethlehem. This second part is frankly Christian, but the story of the martyrdom appears to be based on Jewish legend, though here also is a very interesting section (iii 13 -v 1) which may be described as a kind of Christian Apocalypse. The piece preserved in the newly recovered papyrus extends from ii 4 to iv 4, thus containing the first part of the Christian section. Indeed the primary interest of the papyrus lies in the fact that it tells the story of the Resurrection of Christ in a form not unlike that found in the Akhmim fragment of the Gospel of Peter. The resemblance was traceable in the Ethiopic version, but now that we have the original Greek it is decidedly closer.

The translation given by the editors of this important passage runs as follows (p. 16): 'For Beliar was in great wrath against Isaiah on account of the vision and on account of the revelation, because he revealed Samael, and because through him was manifested the coming forth of the Beloved from the Seventh Heaven, and His transformation, and His descent, and the form into which He must be transformed, even the likeness of man, and the persecution wherewith He shall be persecuted, and the punishments wherewith the children of Israel must punish Him, and the teaching of the twelve, and that He must be crucified with men who are evildoers, and that He shall be buried in a tomb, and that the twelve with Him shall

be offended by Him, and the guarding of the guards of the tomb, and that the descent of the angel of the church which is in heaven . . . in the last days, and that [Gabriel] the angel of the Holy Spirit and Michael the chief of the holy angels on the third day shall open His tomb, and the Beloved seated on their shoulders shall come forth, and that He shall send out His disciples and they shall teach all nations and every tongue unto the resurrection of the Beloved, and those shall be saved who have believed on His cross and on His ascent into the Seventh Heaven whence He also came.' The coming out of Christ from the tomb supported by angels (*Ev. Pet.* § 10) and His immediate ascent thither whence He was sent (*Ev. Pet.* § 13) are features especially characteristic of the Gospel of Peter.

A new critical edition of the Ethiopic version of the *Ascension of Isaiah* by Prof. R. H. Charles is announced, in which the origins and affinities of the book will no doubt be thoroughly examined. Meanwhile a few remarks on some of the proper names in the earlier sections may not be out of place. The work of transcribing the papyrus fragment, it is almost needless to say, has been admirably done by Mr. Grenfell and Mr. Hunt. Only in two places is there any reasonable doubt about their readings.¹ But the forms of the proper names which they have preferred in their accented text and in their notes are here and there open to some question. These names present some interesting features, as being untouched by the Hexaplaric influences which have smoothed down many of the names in codices of the Greek Bible: it is also important to find the right forms, because it will be much easier to illustrate these traditions from other sources, if we can get at the names apart from accidental corruptions affecting only MSS. of the *Ascension*.

In the first place τῆς Βάαλ in ii 12 is not 'a curious error' (p. 18), but the correct form, as may be seen from Rom. xi 4, and from the Prophets (e.g. Zeph. i 4). The meaning of the feminine may be seen from 3 Kings xviii. 19, 25, where the 'prophets of Baal' are called in the lxx. 'prophets τῆς αἰσχύνης,' and no doubt *bosheth* ('shame') used often to be substituted for 'Baal' in reading the Hebrew, in accordance with Hosea ii 17.

¹ Col. III. line 4, read ΧΑΝΔΑΜΙ (a mistake of the scribe himself for *Xavavt*); in Col. V. line 1, is it not possible to read ΕΝΤΗΧΩΠΑΙ (i.e. ἐν τῇ χόρῳ) at the end of the line? It is true that iota adscript does not occur elsewhere in the fragment.

Another instance where the reading of the MS. of the *Ascension* needs no correction is Σαδδουκ in ii 5. This spelling, familiar to us from the name 'Sadducee,' is to be preferred to the Σαδουκ of the Massoretic text and later Jewish tradition. Σαδδουκ is not common in the leading codices of the lxx, which in this as in other matters must have been influenced by Origen's epoch-making correction of the text, but it is still found in 2 Ezr. vii 2 (= 1 Ezr. viii 2), and in the Lucianic recension *passim*.

There are also some corrections to be made connected with the name of the father of the false prophet Bechira or Belicheiar. Bechira is the villain of the piece. Zedekiah son of Chenaanah, the opponent of Michaiiah in the days of Ahab, was his uncle (ii 12), but when Samaria was captured by the King of Assyria, he, being a youth, escaped and settled in Jerusalem, where he lived a reputable life during Hezekiah's reign (iii 2, 3).² When Manasseh came to the throne Bechira threw off the mask, and denounced Isaiah as one who made himself greater than Moses, for Isaiah had dared to say that he had seen the Lord and lived (iii 6-9). Now in ii 15 we read of a certain Jallerjas, a teacher of false prophets. The MS. adds καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ Βεχεῖρ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Ζεδεκίου. Here ὁ Βεχεῖρ is intrusive. It is found also in the Ethiopic, but the ancient Latin fragment in the Vatican (which seems to give by far the purest text of the *Ascension*) omits the name, whereby the clause quoted above refers to Jallerjas. This is very well pointed out by the editors (p. 19). Jallerjas is therefore brother of Zedekiah son of Chenaanah, and so is probably meant for the father of Bechira. That he is the father and not another uncle we shall see later. But a name like Jallerjas is absurd, though it is attested by the Ethiopic. The Latin calls him Gamarias, which is a good Biblical name, in Hebrew *Gemariah*. A Gemariah is mentioned in Jeremiah xxxvi 12 in company with a certain Zedekiah son of Hananiah: this collocation of names may have suggested 'Gamarias' to the author of the *Ascension*. It is easy to see how ἸΑΛ'ΑΠΙΔΑC may have arisen from ΓΑΜΑΠΙΔΑC, in fact, it is not certain that the first letter should not be read Γ.

Further on (in iii 3) there is a corrupted sentence, again best preserved in the Latin. It says that when Bechira fled to Jerusalem,

² The chronology is worthy of the author of the second Targum to Esther.

non ambulabat in [uia] Samariae patris sui. Here again the point of the confusion lies in the proper name, for by reading *G* for *S* we get the genitive of Gamarias. The Greek text at this point is confused and unintelligible.

A somewhat similar confusion occurs in ii 16, where the false prophets are said to have stirred up Ahaziah βασιλεα Γομόρρων to kill Michaiah. This is understood to mean 'King of Gomorrah.' The editors of the *Ascension* say (p. 19): 'That the King of Israel should be called the King of Gomorrah is probably due to the influence of iii 10 (cf. Isaiah i 10), where Isaiah is accused by Belchira of having called Jerusalem Sodom, and the rulers of Judah and Israel the people of Gomorrah,' and I see that this explanation is accepted by Schürer (*Theol. Litzy.* for 1900, p. 604). But as Mr. Grenfell and Mr. Hunt themselves point out, the genitive of Gomorrah in

Greek is Γομόρρας, which actually occurs in the *Ascension* (vii 25). Is it not therefore better to read *C* for *Γ* and consider the doubling of the *P* as a scribal error? We then get COMOPΩN, the more accurate name of the town of Samaria (2 Chron. xiii 4; cf. 3 Kings xvi 24), a word which I suspect also underlies CEMMΩ.. in *Ascen.* ii 13. But if this be so the corruption was earlier than the Vatican fragment, which is said to have *Gomorrah* in ii 16.

Where the author of the *Ascension* got the name of 'Belchira' (or 'Belicheiar,' or 'Bechira') is uncertain. The scribes seem to confuse the word with Beliar 'the angel of lawlessness who ruleth this world.' This at least explains the spelling ΒΕΛΙΧΕΙΔΡ in ii 12. Possibly the name was invented by the author of the *Ascension*.

F. C. BURKITT.

BURY'S HISTORY OF GREECE.

A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great. By J. B. BURY. Macmillan, 1900. Pp. 883. 8s. 6d.

PROFESSOR BURY'S new History of Greece is a serious attempt to combine two objects which are commonly kept apart, the compilation of a school Text Book, and the presentation to the world in general of the personal impressions of a specialist. 'So far as History is concerned' he says in his Preface 'I venture to hold the opinion that those books which are capable of enlisting the interest of mature readers are best also for informing younger students.' It is no light task that is thus undertaken, but it is justified by success. A single volume of 883 pages cannot enter into all the arguments for and against conflicting theories, and we do not look for the fulness of a Grote or a Busolt. None the less the 'Notes and References' at the end of the book, giving primary and secondary authorities, and suggesting justification for most of the newer views propounded in the body of the work, will make it of real value to advanced students, as representing the judgment of a distinguished specialist. The educated public will also find in it a fair and accurate statement of the advance made in Greek History by the work of the last two

decades. Yet in spite of this, the book is primarily just what it was intended to be, an admirable School Text-book. We have not here that most misleading of productions, the book which sails under the cover of a School Series, but is in reality as far removed from the beginner as the professedly learned Octavo. In their laudable desire to give us of their best, more than one of Messrs Macmillan's recent editors have sinned in this direction, and while as Scholars we are duly grateful for the low price at which we obtain magna opera of erudition, we have an uneasy feeling as Teachers that we are only enabled to do so at the expense of our pupils. Professor Bury is true to the traditions of Graves and Page. He does not think it necessary to tell us all he knows, and is superior to the temptations of ἐπιδειξις. Whether he is dealing with the latest combinations of Wilamowitz-Möllendorff—who, it is interesting to note, is almost as completely the W-M. to him that he is to Mr. G. G. A. Murray—or whether he is touching ground on which he is himself our boldest researcher, we find the same sense of proportion, the same self-control in presentation. For one of his own most ingenious theories for instance, that on the shield episode of Marathon, he refers his readers back to the